

Serial No. 09/880,103
Response dated April 17, 2006
Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated 11/15/05

REMARKS

This responds to the Official Action dated November 15, 2005.

The undersigned attorney expresses his appreciation for the careful review of the claims by the Examiner. The two informalities noted in the Official Action have been corrected.

Claims 34-35 and 37-38 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,622,304. Claims 34, 36, and 40 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,377,981 to Ollikainen. These claims are amended without prejudice to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claim 39 was rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,622,304 to Carhart. The Official Action alternatively rejects Claim 39 based on Official Notice or alternatively based on some unspecified combination of Carhart, Ollikainen and U.S. Patent 5,301,194 to Seta. This rejection is traversed. The invention as recited in claim 39 allows a single transceiver card to be utilized with any one of a number of different satellites through the use of a programmable error correction scheme. In this manner, the transceiver card/antenna may be sold to a consumer, plugged into the back of the consumer's PC (or other suitable computer) and programmed via the consumer's PC (or other suitable computer) to work with any one of a number of different satellites. For example, the user can program the receiver card to receive high speed internet from one source, broadcast services from another source, and/or programming broadcasts from a third source. Conventionally, consumers have been locked into predetermined satellite provider. The present invention allows consumers to select from services (e.g., on demand services) from any number of providers.

Claim 41 was rejected as being unpatentable over Carhart in view of Seta. Applicant traverses this rejection. Conventionally, two cards were utilized for transmit and reception from a satellite in a personal computer. This involved a complex arrangement where the transmit card was coupled to a receive card via the industry standard bus in the personal computer. This arrangement was deficient in that the synchronization between the cards was not very precise

Serial No. 09/880,103
Response dated April 17, 2006
Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated 11/15/05

since there was no direct connection. Neither Carhart nor Seta shows this feature of the invention as claimed in Claim 41 either alone or in combination. Cohart shows at best a PC interface card coupled to a satellite. There is no disclosure whatsoever on how this may be done. The application is silent on whether this involves one card, two cards, or no cards such as an external unit. In short, there is no disclosure whatsoever on how the system is configured when coupled to a satellite. Seta shows a local office at one location and a central office at another location with the use of a synchronization signal. Seta does not even relate in any way to a PC card, much less how to structure the connections between the transmit and receive cards. A central office and a local office comprises many cards and is no way related to the problem solved by the present invention. The combination proposed by the Examiner is completely devoid of any teaching to make such a combination in the references. Further, even if the combination were made, it would not result in the claimed invention.

Claims 13-16, 18, 24-26 and 31 were rejected as being unpatentable over various combinations of Cahart, Ollikainen, Seta and U.S. Patent 6,073,188 to Fleming. These claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.


Claims 17 and 19-23 are cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant hereby petitions for any other fees required to maintain the pendency of this case such fee is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Serial No. 09/880,103
Response dated April 17, 2006
Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated 11/15/05

If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action and feels that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Frederic M. Meeker
Registration No. 35,282

Banner & Witcoff, LTD
1001 G Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Phone: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3100

Date: April 17, 2006

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimiled transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on April 17, 2006 to Examiner Christopher Grant at 571-273-8300.


Frederic M. Meeker